January 8, 2007

Date

## United States District Court

## Eastern District of Michigan

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

	V.	ORDER O	F DETENTION PENDING TRIAL
	GARY WILLIAMS	Case Number: (	07-30009
	Defendant		
	accordance with the Bail Reform Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3142 on of the defendant pending trial in this case.	(f), a detention hearing has been	n held. I conclude that the following facts require the
	Pa	rt I—Findings of Fact	
(1)	The defendant is charged with an offense described in or local offense that would have been a federal offens ☐ a crime of violence as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 315	e if a circumstance giving rise t	
	an offense for which the maximum sentence is life		
	an offense for which a maximum term of impriso	nment of ten years or more is p	rescribed in
	a felony that was committed after the defendant h		ore prior federal offenses described in 18 U.S.C.
<b>—</b> (2)	§ 3142(f)(1)(A)-(C), or comparable state or local		1' . ' 1 C . C 1 . 1 1 . 1 . C .
	The offense described in finding (1) was committed who A period of not more than five years has elapsed since		
(4)	for the offense described in finding (1). Findings Nos. (1), (2) and (3) establish a rebuttable presafety of (an) other person(s) and the community. I fi		
		Iternative Findings (A)	is not reduced this presumption.
(1)	There is probable cause to believe that the defendant l	- · ·	
☐ ( <del>-</del> )	for which a maximum term of imprisonment of te		1 .
	under 18 U.S.C. § 924(c).	1	
(2)	The defendant has not rebutted the presumption established appearance of the defendant as required and the sa	•	ion or combination of conditions will reasonably assure
		Iternative Findings (B)	
<b>-/</b> (1)		0 ( /	
(2)	There is a serious risk that the defendant will not apper There is a serious risk that the defendant will endange	er the safety of another person o	r the community.
	Part II—Written	Statement of Reasons for 1	Detention
I fi	nd that the credible testimony and information submitte	d at the hearing establishes by	clear and convincing evidence a prepon-
	of the evidence that	,	_
Defen \$1,500 benzo Defen sched	dant is 51 years old, married, and a long time resic 0 a month. He lives in a home valued at \$240,000, diapines, although he has previously participated in dant has one warrant for failing to appear at a trafficuled arraignments. He has been cited for 15 trafficuled. He has two felony drug convictions, (one held	and he owes \$198,000 on a n a court-ordered substance ic court hearing, and two out s violations, four of which are	a mortgage. He tested positive for opiates and abuse out-patient treatment program in 2000. standing warrants for failure to appear for for failure to comply with traffic court
		irections Regarding Deten	
to the e reasona Govern	e defendant is committed to the custody of the Attorney Goxtent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving serble opportunity for private consultation with defense coment, the person in charge of the corrections facility shares.	ntences or being held in custod ounsel. On order of a court of	y pending appeal. The defendant shall be afforded a the United States or on request of an attorney for the
in conn	ection with a court proceeding.		

## MONA K. MAJZOUB UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Signature of Judge

Name and Title of Judge

\*Insert as applicable: (a) Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. § 801 et seq.); (b) Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. § 951 et seq.); or (c) Section 1 of Act of Sept. 15, 1980 (21 U.S.C. § 955a).

s/ Mona K. Majzoub

07-30009 USA V GARY WILLIAMS

PAGE 2

On the later drug conviction (cocaine) defendant violated the terms of his parole and on 6/5/95 was sentenced to an additional 1, 217 days custody. In 2000 this Defendant was found guilty of fleeing from a Police Officer. On 10/5/06 he was charged with felony assault with a dangerous weapon. The charges were dismissed when the victim, Defendant's nephew, refused to testify against his uncle.

Third party custody to his wife is not feasible as she is a potential target in the instant case. Because defendant poses a risk of flight by a preponderance of the evidence (3 outstanding warrants, one conviction for fleeing a police officer) and poses a danger to the community by clear and convincing evidence (5 prior convictions; of the six firearms involved in the instant case, 2 have been used in separate shootings, one in Pittsburgh and one in Detroit), there is no combination of conditions which would assure the safety of the community or the appearance of this Defendant. Therefore Detention is Ordered.